UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,618	09/25/2003	Stephen T. Flock	D6476	6784
Benjamin Aaroi	7590 07/13/201 n Adler	EXAMINER		
ADLER & ASSOCIATES 8011 Candle Lane			WITCZAK, CATHERINE	
Houston, TX 77071			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3767	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/13/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/670,618	FLOCK ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	CATHERINE N. WITCZAK	3767				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was realiure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>10 Ju</u>	ine 2010					
	action is non-final.					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8,14-19,21-26,28,34,43,44,50 and 51</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>2-6,8,14-19,21-26,28 and 43-51</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 34-37</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment(s)	л П	(DTO 440)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 14, 18-25, and 70-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daikuzono (US 2004/0185067) as modified by Eilers et al (US 2001/0023351).

Daikuzono discloses a device comprising an actuator (41) comprising an abrasive member (21); a piezoelectric material for driving said actuator at a high frequency (see paragraph [0091]); an abrasive material ('peeling agent'); a housing (50); a container (22) comprising a reservoir containing a pharmaceutical (see paragraph [0057]); and a permeable membrane through which the pharmaceutical is released (paragraph [0077]).

Daikuzono discloses the claimed invention except for disclosing the abrasive material being diamond, aluminum oxide, carborundum, or ice. Eilers et al teach in paragraph [0013] that it is known to use aluminum oxide particles as an abrasive material in a microdermabrasion procedure. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Daikuzono with the teaching of Eilers et al since aluminum oxide particles are effective in microdermabrasion treatments.

2. Claims 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daikuzono as modified by Eilers et al and further in view of Avrhami et al (US 2003/0212397).

Now even though Daikuzono as modified by Eilers et al do not explicitly disclose monitoring feedback using an electrical property attention is directed to Avrhami et al. The Avrhami et al reference teaches in paragraphs [0070], [0121], [0124-5], and [0173] monitoring feedback using a heartbeat to perform a safe ablation procedure. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings of Avrhami et al in the device of Daikuzono as modified by Eilers et al to increase the safety of the ablation procedure for better patient outcome.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CATHERINE N. WITCZAK whose telephone number is (571)272-7179. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Sirmons can be reached on (571) 272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/670,618 Page 4

Art Unit: 3767

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Catherine N Witczak/

Examiner, Art Unit 3767

/KEVIN C. SIRMONS/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3767